## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that the reference, Branc et al. (EP 0402960), which was cited in the rejection of claims 28-31, was not listed on any of the PTO-892 Form issued. Applicants again request that another PTO-892 Form be issued listing this reference, so that it may be printed on the face of the patent.

As another preliminary matter, the Shimada (JP 5-174565) is erroneously identified as (JP 5-175565) in the Office Action.

The specification and the drawings have been amended to correct inadvertent errors. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner's allowance of claims 10 and 25 is acknowledged and appreciated.

Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (JP 5-174565) in view of Kumagai (JP 10320724 A). Claims 32-34 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to the remaining claims, because the cited references, even if combined, still would not disclose or suggest an outline of a disk unit for housing at least a temperature or a humidity sensor, heating means and a control circuit, as now described in amended claims 1 and 18.

The Examiner recognizes that "Shimada fails to teach that the sensor is located inside the disk unit." The Kumagai reference is cited as disclosing a sensor inside a disk unit. As now more clearly described in independent claims 1 and 18, the heating means and

the control circuit, in addition to the sensor, are also part of the disk unit in the present invention.

As discussed in the previous Amendment, Shimada discloses a system in which the hard disk 5 is only a part of the system, and is controlled by components in the system that is outside the hard disk, and not incorporated in the hard disk itself. Thus, Shimada does not disclose or suggest the claimed outline for housing the sensor, the heating means and the control circuit, as in the present invention. Kumagai merely discloses a humidity sensor 20 provided near heads 11 and 13 in a floppy disk drive. It does not, however, disclose or suggest housing the heating means and the control circuit in a disk unit. Therefore, even if these two references were combined, they still would not disclose or suggest the feature of the invention for housing the sensor, the heating means and the control circuit in the disk unit. For this reason, claims 1 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2-9, 13-17 and 19-24 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 6 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Olarig et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,280,603) and Kumagai. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because the cited references, even if combined, still would not disclose or suggest the outline for housing at least the sensor, the clock generating circuit and the control circuit. As discussed above, neither Shimada nor Kumagai discloses or suggests housing all of the sensor, the clock generating circuit and the control circuit in the outline of the disk unit.

The Olarig et al. reference also relates to a system including one or more temperature sensors and/or environmental sensors that monitor environmental perimeters that affect the operation of a high-speed memory device. As in Shimada, the Olarig et al. reference discloses temperature sensors which are separate and apart from its memory device. It does not disclose or suggest a disk unit which itself includes features of the temperature sensor or the humidifier sensor. Thus, even if the cited references were combined, the resulting device would still be a broader system which may have some form of temperature sensing element in the system. However, the combination would not result in the disk unit itself having the features as described in independent claims 6 and 23. For this reason, claims 6 and 23 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagisawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,532) in view of Takeshi (JP 5-109261). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because the cited references, even if combined, still would not disclose or suggest the top and the bottom of a double-structure outline which are in fluid communication via a space between the first outline and the second outline, as now recited in claim 28.

As recognized by the Examiner, the Yanagisawa "fails to teach a double-structure for the disk drive." Takeshi discloses a magnetic disk device including a cover 6 and a base 7 which are hollow to house a humidifying desiccating agent. The sides of the disk device, however, are not hollow in Takeshi. Therefore, the cover and the base of the disk device of Takeshi cannot be in fluid communication, as in the present invention. For

this reason, claim 28 and its dependent claims 29 and 31 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada and Kumagai in view of Okada et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed above traversing the rejection of claim 6, in which the same references were cited, even if these references were combined, they still would not disclose or suggest the outline for housing the access circuit in addition to a sensor. For this reason, claim 11, as amended, and its dependent claim 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yotsuya et al. and Kumagai in view of Okada et al. and Schanezer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,046,871). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As in the rejection of claims 11 and 12, the Kumagai reference is cited as disclosing a sensor located inside a disk unit. Claim 26 has now been amended to recite that the outline of the disk unit houses the sensor and the access circuit. This is not disclosed or suggested in Kumagai. For this reason, even if the references were combined, they still would not disclose or suggest this feature of the invention as now described in claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 and its dependent claim 27 are allowable over the cited references.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

B. Joe Kim
Registration No. 41,895

May 25, 2004
300 South Wacker Drive -Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer Number 24978